

c.) Remarks

The Examiner states that "in claim 12 and all occurrences, the claims referred to may not be intended to be in parentheses." Although parentheses are accepted idiomatic grammar and plainly do not render any claims imprecise, the parentheses have been deleted from claims 12, 14, 15, 20 and 24 so as to reduce the issues.

The Examiner also states that in all occurrences, the generic terminology must accompany the capitalized tradenames. In this regard, Applicants wish to point out all tradenames are accompanied by their generic terminology at their first occurrences in the present specification and Applicants are unaware of any reason to insert that redundant language everywhere.

The Examiner further states that the number on page 16 line 26, appears incomplete. In response, Applicants wish to report that number is correct.

Claims 34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C §112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not adequately described in the specification as filed. In response, the Examiner's attention is respectfully invited to specification page 19, lines 21-25 and at page 12, lines 1-3, respectively, as well as in original Example 1.

Claims 2-6, 8-9, 12, 14-15, 18-20, 22-24, 27-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the present invention.

The Examiner states that in claim 2(c), 5(c) and all occurrences, "or reduced coenzyme" is unclear. Although this rejection is respectfully traversed, to simply avoid the issue, Applicants have above amended "(ii) a combination of cholesterol esterase and cholesterol dehydrogenase, and" to read --a combination of cholesterol esterase, cholesterol dehydrogenase and oxidized coenzyme, and--.

The Examiner states that in claim 6(I), "conducting a first reaction of cholesterol" is not understood. Frankly speaking, it is unclear if the objection is to the typographical error or the word itself. In response, the misspelling has been attended to. Additionally, to complete the record, "conducting" means "to direct the performance of, to organize and carry out".^{1/}

Finally, the Examiner states that in claim 29 and all occurrences, "capable of" is indefinite as to what actually occurs. Although this rejection too is not well-understood, the claims have been amended as suggested by the Examiner simply in order to reduce the issues.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all of the Examiner's concerns are now overcome and the claims are now in allowable condition. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this application is earnestly solicited.

Claims 2-6, 8, 9, 12, 14, 15, 18-20, 22-24 and 27-41 remain presented for continued prosecution.

^{1/}

A cursory review of the PTO database indicates that 488 patents have issued since 1976 which use the language "conducting a reaction" in their claims.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Lawrence S. Perry", written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicants
Lawrence S. Perry
Registration No. 31,865

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 342052v1